BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FILED
02/28/20
04:59 PM

Order Instituting Rulemaking into the Review of the California High Cost Fund-A Program.	Rulemaking 11-11-007

OPENING COMMENTS OF THE PUBLIC ADVOCATES OFFICE ON THE ASSIGNED COMMISSIONER'S FIFTH AMENDED SCOPING MEMO AND RULING

(PUBLIC VERSION)

JAYNE PARKER
PATRICK E. HOGLUND, P.E.

Public Advocates Office
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Ave.
San Francisco, CA 94102

CANDACE CHOE

Attorney for the
Public Advocates Office
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Ave.
San Francisco, CA 94102
Telephone: (415) 703-5651
Email: Candace.Choe@cpuc.ca.gov

February 28, 2020

I. INTRODUCTION

The Public Advocates Office at the California Public Utilities Commission (Public Advocates Office) provides these comments in response to the questions and issues in Commissioner Guzman Aceves' December 13, 2019 Fifth Amended Assigned Commissioner's Scoping Memo and Ruling (Scoping Memo). The Scoping Memo broadens questions related to tribal communities under Issue 3 in the Fourth Amended Scoping Memo. The amendment allows parties to consider both California High Cost Fund-A (CHCF-A) and B (CHCF-B) as programs that could support the build out of voice and broadband infrastructure to better serve tribal, rural, low-income, and unserved and underserved areas throughout California. As detailed below, the Commission should prioritize broadband deployment to tribal communities without any broadband access or with limited broadband access. The Commission should also develop a pilot Tribal Broadband Deployment program to deploy affordable broadband at speeds of at least 25 megabits per second (Mbps) download and 3 Mbps upload to unserved and underserved tribal communities. The proposed pilot program will test whether the program is successful in providing tribal communities with the benefit of broadband and increases adoption of broadband services. Furthermore, the pilot program outcomes will help determine if the pilot program is successful, sustainable, and not overly burdensome to California ratepayers. The discussion below follows the outline provided in the Scoping Memo.

II. DISCUSSION

A. Use of the CHCF-A and CHCF-B Funds to (1) Build Out Communications Infrastructure to Tribal, Rural, Low-Income, and Underserved Areas and (2) Building Communications Network Redundancy and Resiliency for Public Safety Purposes.

The recent series of Commission workshops[1] in this proceeding highlighted tribal communities' concerns with the adequacy of their communications services including availability of service, the type of service, and affordability of service offerings. The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and the Native Nations Communications Task Force noted

[1] September 16, 2019, hosted by the Tuolumne Mi-Wuk, September 30, 2019, hosted by the Blue Lake Rancheria, and October 11, 2019, hosted by the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians.

similar concerns, particularly regarding broadband deployment in tribal areas.[2, 3, 4] In particular, the FCC Office of Native Affairs and Policy (ONAP) found that:

> The lack of robust communications services presents serious impediments to Tribal Nations' efforts to preserve their cultures and build their internal structures for self-governance, economic opportunity, health, education, public safety, and welfare.[5]

Similarly, The Congressional Research Service noted the continuing challenge, succinctly stating that "tribal communities stand out as being among the most unserved or underserved populations with respect to broadband deployment."[6] As our analysis below shows, these circumstances also affect California tribal communities.[7]

The CHCF-A program is available to rural telephone corporations (small local exchange carriers) that serve as Carriers of Last Resort (COLR) in California.[8] The CHCF-B program currently provides subsidies to mid-size and large Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers (ILECs) that serve as COLRs to facilitate affordable basic telephone service in high-cost areas. Both

---

[2] Report on Broadband Deployment in Indian Country, Pursuant to the Repack Airwaves Yielding Better Access for Users of Modern Services Act of 2018, May 2019, https://www.fcc.gov/document/report-broadband-deployment-indian-country.

[3] Native Nations Communications Task Force, Improving and Increasing Broadband Deployment on Tribal Lands, Report to the Federal Communications Commission from the Tribal Members of the Task Force, Adopted November 5, 2019, https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=2&ved=2ahUKEwihzoip6OPnAhWSrJ4KHQ9hCZMQFjABegQIARAB&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.fcc.gov%2Fsites%2Fdefault%2Ffiles%2Fnnctf_tribal_broadband_report.pdf&usg=AOvVaw2Q0PLAFuMugiUSbsTc5WsB.

[4] See for example, WC docket No. 19-126, WC Docket No. 10-90, GN Docket No. 17-199.

[5] FCC, Office of Native Affairs and Policy, *2012 Annual Report*, p. 6.

[6] Congressional Research Service, Tribal Broadband: Status of Deployment and Federal Funding Programs, Updated November 7, 2018.

[7] Federally-Recognized Tribes in California, https://www.ihs.gov/california/index.cfm/tribal-consultation/resources-for-tribal-leaders/links-and-resources/list-of-federally-recognized-tribes-in-ca/, and "California Native American tribe" means a Native American tribe located in California that is on the contact list maintained by the Native American Heritage Commission for the purposes of Chapter 905 of the Statutes of 2004. (*See* Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 21073.) California Native American tribes include both federally recognized tribes and tribes that are not recognized by the federal government.

[8] PU Code Section 275.6. Only 10 of these 13 small local exchange carriers were examined because they receive CHCF-A subsidies. Those carriers are: Calaveras Telephone Company, Cal-Ore Telephone Company, Ducor Telephone Company, Foresthill Telephone Company, Kerman Telephone Company, Pinnacles Telephone Company, Sierra Telephone Company, The Ponderosa Telephone Company, The Siskiyou Telephone Company, and Volcano Telephone Company.

programs are meant to support the Commission's universal service goals.[9] Tribal customers, as customers of communications providers that currently receive either CHCF-A or CHCF-B subsidies should benefit from the support of both funds.

1. Tribal Communities Served by Communications Companies Eligible for Either the CHCF-A or the CHCF-B, or No Communications Companies.

The Commission has census block data readily available for 102 of the 110 federally recognized tribes in California. There are approximately 55 additional California tribal communities that are not federally recognized. The Native American Heritage Commission was not able to share the names and locations of these 55 tribal communities with the Public Advocates Office because of confidentiality concerns. Census block data was analyzed to determine broadband availability in tribal communities from communications providers participating in the CHCF-A and CHCF-B programs.[10] There are several tribal communities located in CHCF-A or CHCF-B territories that do not have broadband access. See Table 2 for details on tribal communities that lack broadband at any speed.

[9] As set forth in PU Code § 709 (c), To encourage the development and deployment of new technologies and the equitable provision of services in a way that efficiently meets consumer need and encourages the ubiquitous availability of a wide choice of state-of-the-art services, and §709(d), To assist in bridging the "digital divide" by encouraging expanded access to state-of-the-art technologies for rural, inner-city, low-income, and disabled California.

[10] Broadband data was provided to the Commission by the Carriers included in Appendix 1 apart from Comcast's broadband deployment, which was retrieved from their December 2018 FCC 477 filing. The CPUC's definition of broadband mirrors that of the FCC. The FCC measures broadband availability as "broadband connections are available in a census block if the provider does, or could, within a service interval that is typical for that type of connection—that is, without an extraordinary commitment of resources—provision two way data transmission to and from the Internet with advertised speeds exceeding 200 kilobytes per second (kbps) in at least one direction to end-user premises in the census block" https://transition.fcc.gov/form477/477inst.pdf. This definition overstates the amount of broadband available for customers as it includes all households in a census block if just one household is served or is able to be served within a typical service connection timeframe. At this time, there is no better metric for uniformly measuring broadband across tribal areas.

***Table 1: Broadband Availability by Funding Program*[11]**

Funding Type	# of Tribes within Service Territory	Households	Population	Broadband Access by Download Speed				Fiber	Rural % by Household
				≥6 Mbps	≥10 Mbps	≥25 Mbps	≥50 Mbps		
CHCF-A	8	2,015	4,556	84%	84%	44%	43%	24%	90%
CHCF-B	58	51,240	86,878	88%	88%	83%	77%	18%	29%
No Funding	41	9,597	25,074	93%	93%	87%	84%	19%	40%
Grand Total*	102	61,194	112,744	89%	89%	84%	78%	18%	31%

*Grand Total row reflects the number of tribes for which data is available and not the cumulative total of the column as some Tribes have access to both CHCF-A and CHCF-B service territories.

Table 1 shows that eight tribal communities fall within the Small Local Exchange Carriers (Small LECs) service territory. These Small LECs receive CHCF-A subsidies, which support the deployment of broadband capable networks in rural areas.[12] Table 1 shows that 58 tribes fall within census blocks eligible for CHCF-B. Five tribes are located in areas where carriers can obtain both CHCF-A and CHCF-B subsidies.[13] Combined, there are over 51,000 tribal households within CHCF-A service territories and eligible CHCF-B census block groups.[14] However, there are 41 tribes with over 9,500 households that are served by providers who are unable to obtain either CHCF-A or CHCF-B subsidies. Of the 102 tribes examined, 15 had no broadband access as of December 2018 as illustrated in Table 2.

[11] 2018 Validated CPUC Deployment figures submitted to the CPUC pursuant to D.16-12-025 and 2010 Census Household and population numbers.

[12] P.U. Code 275.6 (a) The commission shall exercise its regulatory authority to maintain the California High-Cost Fund-A Administrative Committee Fund program (CHCF-A program) to provide universal service rate support to small independent telephone corporations in amounts sufficient to meet the revenue requirements established by the commission through rate-of-return regulation in furtherance of the state's universal service commitment to the continued affordability and widespread availability of safe, reliable, high-quality communications services in rural areas of the state.

[13] Big Sandy, Karuk, Picayune, Quartz Valley, Table Mountain.

[14] The 51,000 households figure does not double count the tribal households that have both CHCF-A and CHCF-B available to them.

The Commission should prioritize broadband deployment to tribal communities without any broadband access or with limited broadband access. To this end, a more detailed look at the unserved[15] and underserved[16] tribes is shown in Appendix 1: Table 1 below.

While broadband service may be available under the FCC definition of availability,[17] the service offered may not be affordable for tribal communities. Subscribership figures in tribal communities are very low. For example, AT&T's broadband deployment data states that AT&T provides broadband to roughly <<**Begin Confidential**>> [redacted] <<**End Confidential**>> tribal households in 50 tribes. However, their subscribership in the same time period totals <<**Begin Confidential**>> [redacted] <<**End Confidential**>> subscribers. This is an adoption rate of <<**Begin Confidential**>> [redacted] <<**End Confidential**>>.[18] Likewise, Frontier states that it deploys broadband to over <<**Begin Confidential**>> [redacted] <<**End Confidential**>> households encompassing 36 tribes. However, the number of subscribers in the same time period was just over <<**Begin Confidential**>> [redacted] <<**End Confidential**>>; a subscriber rate of roughly <<**Begin Confidential**>> [redacted] <<**End Confidential**>>.[19] These numbers suggest that there is significant under adoption in tribal communities. Furthermore, broadband availability figures may be overstated in tribal communities due to the FCC's definition of broadband availability.[20]

[15] Unserved in this analysis means "no access to broadband" services.

[16] Underserved in this analysis means "access to broadband speeds <25 Mbps download.

[17] The FCC measures broadband availability as "broadband connections are available in a census block if the provider does, or could, within a service interval that is typical for that type of connection—that is, without an extraordinary commitment of resources—provision two way data transmission to and from the Internet with advertised speeds exceeding 200 kbps in at least one direction to end-user premises in the census block" https://transition.fcc.gov/form477/477inst.pdf. This definition overstates the amount of broadband available for customers as it includes all households in a census block if just one household is served or is able to be served within a typical service connection timeframe. At this time, there is no better metric for uniformly measuring broadband across tribal areas.

[18] Assuming one subscriber per household.

[19] Assuming one subscriber per household.

[20] This definition overstates the amount of broadband available for customers as it includes all households in a census block if just one household is served or is able to be served within a typical service connection timeframe. At this time, there is no better metric for uniformly measuring broadband across tribal areas.

Table 2: Unserved and Underserved Broadband Access by Tribe: Summary

Priority	Tribal Count	Household Count	Population Count	Tribes located within CHCF-A Service territory	Tribes within census block groups eligible for CHCF-B funding
No Broadband	15	2,293	5,679	0	10
< 6 Mbps	1	8	23	0	1
< 10 Mbps	2	16	34	0	0
< 25 Mbps	12	2,034	4,621	2	9

Table 2 illustrates the number of tribes with no access to broadband service as of December 31, 2018 and those that have no access to certain speeds. There are 15 tribes with no access to broadband and 10 of these tribes fall in census block groups that are eligible for CHCF-B funding. These tribes are broken down in further detail in Appendix 1: Table 1. These tribes would benefit from a pilot Tribal Broadband Deployment program.

B. Specific Priorities and Recommendations for Preferred Strategies the Commission Should Consider for Achieving the Desired Outcomes Identified in Section A Above.

Consistent with California Public Utilities (P.U.) Code Section 709, the Commission should prioritize broadband deployment to tribal communities identified as unserved or underserved in Figure 2 above. This may be accomplished by providing California Advanced Services Fund (CASF) grant funding to tribal communities to deploy broadband infrastructure and CHCF-B funding for on-going high-cost support in providing the service.[21]

The CASF through its Infrastructure Grant program can provide grant funding.[22] Tribal governments are eligible to apply for CASF Infrastructure grants.[23] However, since 2013 only

[21] The Native Nations Task Force noted in its report, at page 21, to the FCC that "…grant rather than loan funding is the optimal form of support for Tribes due to the unique Tribal land ownership issues …." This conclusion was based on the experiences of Tribes who have successfully deployed networks in their communities.

[22] Broadband Infrastructure Account Requirements, Guidelines and Application Materials, Section 4, p. 8, footnote 8, "For the purposes of this program, tribal governmental entities may also apply for CASF grants. Because the statute does not address specifically tribal governmental entities, which are sovereign, and distinctly different, we will provide them with the same treatment as local government agencies."

[23] Appendix 1, Broadband Infrastructure Account Requirements, Guidelines and Application Materials,

one tribal project has received CASF funding.[24] Grant funding may provide for deployment of broadband infrastructure; however, ongoing operational costs, especially in rural, low-density areas may be particularly high and present affordability challenges for customers. The Commission should consider providing ongoing high-cost support to tribal communities through the CHCF-B program or a separate fund.

To test the above recommendation, the Commission should develop a pilot Tribal Broadband Deployment program to deploy affordable broadband at speeds of at least 25 Mbps download and 3 Mbps upload to the unserved and underserved tribal communities identified in Table 2 above. The pilot program should target the unserved and underserved tribal communities identified in Table 2 above and combine the grant funding elements of the CASF program with high-cost support elements in the CHCF-B program. The Public Advocates Office provides a sample of elements the Tribal Broadband Deployment program should contain in Appendix 2.

The methodology and amounts of CHCF-B subsidies for the pilot program should be explored in workshops. For example, to calculate the amounts of CHCF-B subsidies that should be granted to tribal communities, the Commission should:

- Estimate operating costs per household for the pilot program (alternatively pilot program applicants could be required to provide estimated operating costs in their applications);
- Consult with the pilot program tribal communities to determine affordability standards for voice and broadband services that incorporate comparable services provided by nearby providers and the targeted households' median household incomes;
- The monthly CHCF-B subsidy would be the difference between the estimated monthly operating costs and the expected monthly revenues from subscribers in the pilot program; and
- Other considerations.

The pilot program will test the revised approach to assess if the desired benefits to tribal communities are actualized. The desired benefits include broadband availability in areas that

---

Page 8, Footnote 8, "For the purposes of this program, tribal governmental entities may also apply for CASF grants. Because the statute does not address specifically tribal governmental entities, which are sovereign, and distinctly different, we will provide them with the same treatment as local government agencies."

[24] Klamath River Rural Broadband Initiative (KRRBI), a partnership between the Karuk Tribe and the Yurok Tribe.

currently lack it and increased adoption of broadband services. Furthermore, analysis of the pilot program outcomes will help determine if the pilot program is successful, sustainable, and not overly burdensome to California ratepayers.

C. Procedural Mechanisms the Commission Should Consider to Implement the Purposes Identified in Section A Above.

1. Whether CHCF-A and B Can be Used to Support Broadband Adoption in Tribal Communities.

The CHCF-A program requires participating companies to be incumbent small independent telephone corporations that meet the following requirements:

1) Be subject to rate-of-return regulation.
2) Be subject to the Commission's regulation of telephone corporations pursuant to this division.
3) Be a carrier of last resort in their service territory.
4) Qualify as a rural telephone company under federal law (47 U.S.C. Sec. 153(44)).[25]

Thus, tribal communities cannot participate in the CHCF-A program directly. However, the Commission should use a workshop, in addition to this round of comments, to identify other ways that the CHCF-A program can support wireline telephone and broadband services in tribal communities.

Under P.U. Code §276.5, the CHCF-B is to provide universal rate support to "telephone corporations." Thus, there appears to be no specific restriction to providing CHCF-B support directly to tribal communities who organize as "telephone corporations." Indeed, PU Code §276.5 specifies that the purpose of the CHCF-B is to support the goals of universal telephone service. The Commission has previously found that "universal service is defined as an "evolving level of telecommunications services … taking into account advances in telecommunications and information technologies and services."[26] The Commission should continue to consider this definition of universal service as it seeks to find solutions to improve broadband access and adoption in tribal and other unserved and underserved areas of the State.

[25] PU Code §275.6.

[26] Interim Opinion Implementing the California Advanced Services Fund (D.07-12-054) Dec. 20, 2007 at 14, http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PublishedDocs/WORD_PDF/FINAL_DECISION/76947.PDF.

II. CONCLUSION

The Public Advocates Office looks forward to participating in this phase of the rulemaking. The Tribal Broadband Deployment Pilot Program should combine the grant elements of the CASF program and the ongoing high-cost subsidy elements of CHCF-B. Additional workshops will present the Commission with a robust record and the opportunity to develop a program to increase access to advanced communications services in tribal communities.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ CANDACE CHOE
Candace Choe
Attorney for

Public Advocates Office
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102
Telephone: (415) 703-5651
Email: Candace.Choe@cpuc.ca.gov

February 28, 2020

APPENDIX 1

Table 1: Unserved and Underserved Broadband Access by Tribe: Breakdown[1]

Priority	Tribe	Household	Population	Broadband Availability by Download Speed and Household totals				Fiber	Tribes within CHCF-A Service Territory	Tribes within census blocks eligible for CHCF-B funding	% Rural Households
				≥6 Mbps	≥10 Mbps	≥25 Mbps	≥50 Mbps				
No Access to Broadband	Alturas	1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	N	Y	100%
	Auburn	10	23	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	N	Y	100%
	Benton Paiute	82	159	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	N	Y	100%
	Fort Bidwell	80	134	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	N	Y	100%
	Grindstone	60	190	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	N	Y	100%
	Hoopa Valley	1,189	3,068	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	N	Y	100%
	Inaja and Cosmit	9	11	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	N	Y	100%
	Jamul	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	N	N	100%
	Laytonville	148	379	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	N	N	100%
	Likely	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	N	N	100%
	Lytton	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	N	N	100%
	Paskenta	39	78	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	N	Y	100%
	Resighini	10	31	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	N	N	100%
	Round Valley	643	1,528	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	N	Y	100%
	Stewarts Point	22	78	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	N	Y	100%
Total	**15**	**2,293**	**5,679**						**0**	**10**	**100%**
Broadband Access < 6 Mbps	Cortina	8	23	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	N	Y	100%
Total	**1**	**8**	**23**						**0**	**1**	**100%**

[1] 2018 Deployment data provided to the CPUC by AT&T California, Charter Communications Inc, Cox Communications, Frontier Communications, Frontier Communications of CA, Frontier Communications of the Southwest, Mediacom California LLC, Sierra Telephone Company, Siskiyou Telephone Company, Suddenlink Communications, The Ponderosa Telephone Co, Volcano Telephone Company. Comcast deployment records for 2018 were downloaded by census block from the FCC's December 2018 477 Data. 2010 Census Household and population numbers utilized.

Priority	Tribe	Household	Population	Broadband Availability by Download Speed and Household totals				Fiber	Tribes within CHCF-A Service Territory	Tribes within census blocks eligible for CHCF-B funding	% Rural Households
				≥6 Mbps	≥10 Mbps	≥25 Mbps	≥50 Mbps				
Broadband Access < 10 Mbps	Dry Creek	11	20	45%	0%	0%	0%	0%	N	N	100%
	Roaring Creek	5	14	100 %	0%	0%	0%	0%	N	N	100%
Total	**2**	**16**	**34**						**0**	**0**	**100%**
Broadband Access < 25 Mbps	Barona	414	1,155	30%	30%	0%	0%	8%	N	Y	98.5%
	Enterprise	110	174	5%	5%	0%	0%	0%	N	Y	100%
	Hopland	82	223	40%	40%	0%	0%	0%	N	Y	100%
	La Posta	34	83	24%	24%	0%	0%	0%	N	Y	100%
	Los Coyotes	153	284	88%	88%	0%	0%	0%	N	Y	100%
	Manchester-Point Arena	131	286	39%	39%	0%	0%	0%	N	Y	100%
	Manzanita	49	111	18%	18%	0%	0%	0%	N	N	100%
	Mesa Grande	101	258	100 %	100%	0%	0%	0%	N	Y	100%
	Picayune	472	949	100 %	100%	0%	0%	72%	Y	Y	100%
	Quartz Valley	210	478	18%	18%	0%	0%	0%	Y	Y	100%
	Santa Ysabel	240	513	41%	41%	0%	0%	0%	N	N	100%
	Table Bluff	38	107	11%	11%	0%	0%	0%	N	N	100%
Total	**12**	**2,034**	**4,621**						**2**	**9**	**99.70%**

Table 2: Communications Providers Providing Broadband per Tribe

Tribe	Carrier 1	Carrier 2	Carrier 3
Agua Caliente	Charter Communications Inc	Frontier Communications	
Augustine	Frontier Communications		
Barona	AT&T California	Cox Communications	
Berry Creek	AT&T California	Comcast	
Big Bend	Frontier Communications of California		
Big Pine	Frontier Communications	Suddenlink Communications	
Big Sandy	The Ponderosa Telephone Co.		
Big Valley	AT&T California	Mediacom California LLC	
Bishop	Frontier Communications	Suddenlink Communications	
Bridgeport	Frontier Communications	Frontier Communications of the Southwest	
Cabazon	Charter Communications Inc	Frontier	Frontier Communications
Cahuilla	Frontier Communications		
Campo	AT&T California		
Capitan Grande	AT&T California	Cox Communications	
Cedarville	Frontier Communications of California		
Chemehuevi	Frontier Communications of the Southwest	Suddenlink Communications	
Chicken Ranch	AT&T California	Comcast	
Cold Springs	The Ponderosa Telephone Co.		
Colusa	Frontier Communications of California		
Cortina	Frontier Communications of California		
Coyote Valley	AT&T California		
Dry Creek	AT&T California		

Tribe	Carrier 1	Carrier 2	Carrier 3
Elk Valley	Charter Communications Inc	Frontier Communications of California	
Enterprise	AT&T California		
Ewiiaapaayp	AT&T California		
Fort Independence	Frontier Communications		
Greenville	Frontier Communications of California		
Guidiville	AT&T California	Comcast	
Hopland	AT&T California		
Ione Band of Miwok	AT&T California		
Jackson	AT&T California	Volcano Internet Provider	
Karuk	AT&T California	Siskiyou Telephone Company	
La Jolla	AT&T California	Mediacom California LLC	
La Posta	AT&T California		
Lone Pine	Frontier Communications		
Lookout	Frontier Communications of California		
Los Coyotes	AT&T California		
Manchester-Point Arena	AT&T California		
Manzanita	AT&T California		
Mechoopda	AT&T California	Comcast	
Mesa Grande	AT&T California		
Middletown	AT&T California		
Montgomery Creek	Frontier Communications of California		
Mooretown	AT&T California	Comcast	
Morongo	Charter Communications Inc	Frontier Communications	
North Fork	The Ponderosa Telephone Co.		
Pala	AT&T California		
Pauma and Yuima	AT&T California		

Tribe	Carrier 1	Carrier 2	Carrier 3
Pechanga	Charter Communications Inc	Frontier Communications	
Picayune	Sierra Tel Internet		
Pinoleville	AT&T California		
Pit River	Frontier Communications of California		
Quartz Valley	AT&T California		
Ramona	Frontier Communications		
Redding	AT&T California	Charter Communications Inc	
Rincon	AT&T California	Mediacom California LLC	
Roaring Creek	Frontier Communications of California		
Robinson	AT&T California		
Rohnerville	AT&T California		
Rumsey	AT&T California	Frontier Communications of California	
San Manuel	AT&T California	Charter Communications Inc	Frontier Communications
San Pasqual	AT&T California		
Santa Rosa	AT&T California	Comcast	Frontier Communications
Santa Ynez	Frontier Communications		
Santa Ysabel	AT&T California		
Sherwood Valley	AT&T California	Comcast	
Shingle Springs	AT&T California		
Smith River	Charter Communications Inc	Frontier Communications of California	
Soboba	Charter Communications Inc	Frontier Communications	
Sulphur Bank	AT&T California		
Susanville	Frontier Communications of California		
Sycuan	AT&T California	Cox Communications	
Table Bluff	AT&T California		

Tribe	Carrier 1	Carrier 2	Carrier 3
Table Mountain	AT&T California	The Ponderosa Telephone Co.	
Torres-Martinez	Frontier Communications		
Trinidad	AT&T California	Suddenlink Communications	
Tule River	AT&T California	Charter Communications Inc	
Tuolumne	AT&T California	Comcast	Frontier Communications of California
Twenty-Nine Palms	Frontier Communications		
Upper Lake	AT&T California		
Viejas	AT&T California		
Woodfords	Frontier Communications of the Southwest		
XL Ranch	Frontier Communications of California		
Yurok	Frontier Communications of California		
Big Lagoon	Suddenlink Communications		
Blue Lake	Suddenlink Communications		
Redwood Valley	Comcast		
Total	**87**	**33**	**4**

Table 3: Tribal Broadband Availability as of December 31, 2018

Tribe	Household	Population	Broadband Availability by Download Speed and Household Totals				Fiber	Tribes within CHCF-A Service territory	Tribes within census blocks eligible for CHCF-B funding
			≥6 Mbps	≥10 Mbps	≥25 Mbps	≥50 Mbps			
Agua Caliente	34,738	44,889	100%	100%	100%	100%	22%	N	Y
Alturas	1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	N	Y
Auburn	10	23	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	N	Y
Augustine	426	1,644	100%	100%	100%	100%	99%	N	N
Barona	414	1,155	30%	30%	0%	0%	8%	N	Y
Benton Paiute	82	159	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	N	Y
Berry Creek	188	445	59%	59%	59%	59%	0%	N	Y
Big Bend	4	10	100%	100%	100%	0%	0%	N	N
Big Lagoon	80	64	91%	91%	91%	91%	0%	N	N
Big Pine	214	528	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	N	N
Big Sandy	290	700	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	Y	Y
Big Valley	195	443	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	N	N
Bishop	1,287	3,080	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	N	N
Blue Lake	74	155	86%	86%	86%	86%	0%	N	N
Bridgeport	146	236	100%	100%	95%	0%	0%	N	Y
Cabazon	841	3,431	99%	99%	98%	79%	72%	N	N
Cahuilla	258	575	88%	88%	80%	0%	0%	N	Y
Campo	321	745	86%	86%	6%	0%	0%	N	Y
Capitan Grande	34	84	35%	35%	32%	32%	0%	N	Y
Cedarville	10	17	90%	90%	90%	0%	0%	N	N
Chemehuevi	760	328	54%	54%	54%	0%	0%	N	Y
Chicken Ranch	37	82	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	N	N
Cold Springs	89	265	100%	100%	91%	91%	0%	Y	N
Colusa	62	160	42%	42%	42%	0%	0%	N	N
Cortina	8	23	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	N	Y
Coyote Valley	58	217	91%	48%	48%	48%	0%	N	N
Dry Creek	11	20	45%	0%	0%	0%	0%	N	N
Elk Valley	211	510	100%	100%	100%	100%	10%	N	N

Tribe	Household	Population	Broadband Availability by Download Speed and Household Totals				Fiber	Tribes within CHCF-A Service territory	Tribes within census blocks eligible for CHCF-B funding
			≥6 Mbps	≥10 Mbps	≥25 Mbps	≥50 Mbps			
Enterprise	110	174	5%	5%	0%	0%	0%	N	Y
Ewiiaapaayp	79	194	92%	92%	92%	92%	0%	N	Y
Fort Bidwell	80	134	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	N	Y
Fort Independence	55	102	100%	100%	98%	9%	0%	N	N
Greenville	163	314	100%	90%	90%	0%	0%	N	Y
Grindstone	60	190	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	N	Y
Guidiville	201	495	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	N	N
Hoopa Valley	1,189	3,068	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	N	Y
Hopland	82	223	40%	40%	0%	0%	0%	N	Y
Inaja and Cosmit	9	11	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	N	Y
Ione Band of Miwok	144	289	87%	85%	76%	38%	0%	N	Y
Jackson	80	161	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	Y	N
Jamul	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	N	N
Karuk	471	1,110	66%	66%	16%	16%	12%	Y	Y
La Jolla	249	604	59%	59%	5%	5%	0%	N	Y
La Posta	34	83	24%	24%	0%	0%	0%	N	Y
Laytonville	148	379	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	N	N
Likely	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	N	N
Lone Pine	165	362	100%	100%	100%	82%	0%	N	N
Lookout	31	53	84%	84%	61%	0%	0%	N	Y
Los Coyotes	153	284	88%	88%	0%	0%	0%	N	Y
Lytton	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	N	N
Manchester-Point Arena	131	286	39%	39%	0%	0%	0%	N	Y
Manzanita	49	111	18%	18%	0%	0%	0%	N	N
Mechoopda	1,736	4,150	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	N	N
Mesa Grande	101	258	100%	100%	0%	0%	0%	N	Y
Middletown	40	103	93%	93%	45%	45%	0%	N	Y
Montgomery Creek	14	39	50%	50%	21%	0%	0%	N	Y
Mooretown	158	441	100%	95%	95%	95%	0%	N	Y
Morongo	842	1,996	94%	94%	94%	87%	87%	N	Y
North Fork	188	366	100%	100%	73%	72%	0%	Y	N

Tribe	Household	Population	Broadband Availability by Download Speed and Household Totals				Fiber	Tribes within CHCF-A Service territory	Tribes within census blocks eligible for CHCF-B funding
			≥6 Mbps	≥10 Mbps	≥25 Mbps	≥50 Mbps			
Pala	599	1,766	76%	76%	12%	12%	0%	N	Y
Paskenta	39	78	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	N	Y
Pauma and Yuima	110	352	82%	82%	28%	21%	0%	N	N
Pechanga	652	1,672	92%	92%	85%	79%	68%	N	Y
Picayune	472	949	100%	100%	0%	0%	72%	Y	Y
Pinoleville	134	389	100%	100%	99%	99%	0%	N	N
Pit River	30	85	93%	93%	93%	0%	0%	N	Y
Quartz Valley	210	478	18%	18%	0%	0%	0%	Y	Y
Ramona	127	200	98%	98%	98%	0%	0%	N	Y
Redding	33	78	100%	100%	100%	100%	39%	N	N
Redwood Valley	417	1,099	97%	97%	97%	97%	0%	N	Y
Resighini	10	31	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	N	N
Rincon	546	1,748	90%	90%	40%	38%	0%	N	N
Roaring Creek	5	14	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	N	N
Robinson	203	497	95%	95%	84%	84%	0%	N	N
Rohnerville	122	337	98%	98%	98%	98%	0%	N	N
Round Valley	643	1,528	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	N	Y
Rumsey	145	310	100%	100%	99%	0%	0%	N	Y
San Manuel	331	894	100%	100%	100%	100%	3%	N	N
San Pasqual	591	1,720	93%	93%	85%	78%	0%	N	Y
Santa Rosa	348	902	22%	18%	13%	2%	0%	N	Y
Santa Ynez	338	841	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	N	N
Santa Ysabel	240	513	41%	41%	0%	0%	0%	N	N
Sherwood Valley	236	602	93%	93%	93%	93%	0%	N	Y
Shingle Springs	199	505	45%	45%	37%	37%	0%	N	N
Smith River	205	416	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	N	N
Soboba	706	1,253	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	N	N
Stewarts Point	22	78	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	N	Y
Sulphur Bank	24	69	96%	96%	46%	46%	0%	N	N
Susanville	452	1,312	90%	90%	74%	0%	0%	N	Y

Tribe	Household	Population	Broadband Availability by Download Speed and Household Totals				Fiber	Tribes within CHCF-A Service territory	Tribes within census blocks eligible for CHCF-B funding
			≥6 Mbps	≥10 Mbps	≥25 Mbps	≥50 Mbps			
Sycuan	973	2,496	99%	96%	93%	90%	2%	N	Y
Table Bluff	38	107	11%	11%	0%	0%	0%	N	N
Table Mountain	215	527	100%	100%	100%	100%	46%	Y	Y
Torres-Martinez	1,809	7,429	71%	71%	67%	0%	0%	N	Y
Trinidad	128	315	88%	88%	66%	66%	0%	N	N
Tule River	381	1,275	41%	41%	41%	20%	0%	N	Y
Tuolumne	361	755	100%	100%	96%	91%	0%	N	N
Twenty-Nine Palms	53	142	100%	92%	83%	83%	0%	N	Y
Upper Lake	101	185	99%	91%	89%	89%	0%	N	Y
Viejas	311	789	70%	67%	47%	23%	3%	N	Y
Woodfords	140	373	56%	26%	26%	5%	0%	N	Y
XL Ranch	140	254	40%	39%	34%	0%	0%	N	Y
Yurok	744	1,413	25%	23%	23%	1%	1%	N	Y
Grand Total	**61,194**	**112,744**	**89%**	**89%**	**84%**	**78%**	**18%**	**8**	**58**

APPENDIX 2

Sample Tribal Broadband Deployment Pilot Program elements and workshop topics:

The workshops should focus on developing the details of the Tribal Broadband Deployment Pilot Program. Parameters for the program may be informed by existing CASF requirements and LifeLine pilot program requirements.

At a minimum the workshops should incorporate specific recommendations for the following elements:

- a detailed description of the proposed pilot program project, and the expected benefits,
- a detailed project budget,
- the project duration,
- data collection methodology,
- a detailed evaluation plan,
- robust consumer safeguards, and
- clear detailed payment and reporting requirements.

Below are some examples of sample pilot program criteria.

Eligible Applicants

An "Eligible Applicant" is the unserved or underserved Tribal entity identified in Figure 2.

A representative, including a facilities-based broadband provider, may submit applications for the pilot program on behalf of an eligible Tribal community.

Subsidy Level

The Tribal Broadband Deployment Pilot Program will subsidize 100% of the broadband deployment cost of the proposed project through a CASF grant. The maximum subsidy amount of the total pilot program/per customer location for infrastructure deployment is a maximum of $10,000 for Wireline installations. Ongoing monthly operational cost support through the CHCF-B will be calculated as (estimated monthly operational costs – expected monthly customer revenues) and does not exceed the Commission's adopted "not to exceed" monthly support amount.

Eligible Projects

An eligible project is a project that deploys broadband of at least 25 Mbps download and 3 Mbps upload to households that are part of the tribal communities identified in Figure 2.

The project will provide a service connection to an unserved or underserved household.

The completed project will include a low-income broadband plan offering for eligible households.

Ministerial Review

The Commission delegates to Communications Division Staff the task of approving Pilot applications that meet all of the following criteria:

- The proposed project is an Eligible Project.
- The proposed project connects an Eligible Applicant.
- The proposed project does not exceed $10,000 per Wireline installation per household and ongoing monthly operational support does not exceed the amount calculated in the Subsidy Level section above.
- The Pilot Program application is not challenged, or Communications Division Staff denies the challenge.
- All projects must be completed in 24 months.
- The project must include a low-income broadband plan.